

1556

Pamphlet Box, B3

A Bishop's Condjutor.

REMARKS ON A CANON PROPOSED BY THE MOST REVEREND THE LORD BISHOP OF FREDERICTON, IN THE MONTH OF JUNE, A. D. 1879.

SAINT JOHN, N. B.

J. & A. McMILLAN, STEAM BOOK AND JOB PRINTERS.
98 & 100 Prince William Street.

1879.

A Bishop Coadjutor.

REMARKS ON A CANON PROPOSED BY THE MOST REVEREND THE LORD BISHOP OF FREDERICTON, IN THE MONTH OF JUNE, A. D. 1879.

~~~~~  
SAINT JOHN, N. B.

J. & A. McMILLAN, STEAM BOOK AND JOB PRINTERS.

98 & 100 Prince William Street.

1879.

A very general interest has been awakened by the recent proposal, by the Lord Bishop of the Diocese, of a Canon for the appointment and election of a Bishop Coadjutor. The sudden termination of the meeting of the Synod at Fredericton in July, rendered it impossible for the opponents of the measure to answer fully, at that time, the statements of its supporters. And it appears but right that both sides of the question should be fairly stated, and an opportunity thus given for full consideration, before the approaching Special Meeting of the Synod takes place.

AUGUST, 1879.

---

*Copies of this Pamphlet may be had on application to the Publishers.*

## REMARKS.

---

WITHOUT the authority of an Act of Incorporation, the greater number of the Clergy of the Diocese of Fredericton, with Lay Delegates from most of the Parishes, adopted in July, 1867, a Synodical Constitution.

At the meeting at which this took place, a Committee was appointed "to consider all questions connected with the . . . . .  
"powers to be given to the Synod . . . . . and to prepare such  
"measures to be submitted for approval at the next meeting . . .  
"as in their opinion may be required."

In July, 1868, this Committee accordingly submitted their Report, recommending, among other matters, a Canon for the election of a Bishop on the occurrence of a vacancy in the See.

Their Report was adopted, and the Canon agreed to.

In 1871 the entire Diocese united in the Synod under the Act of Incorporation then obtained, and adopted most of the measures passed at the preceding Synodical meetings; and, among others, the Canon above referred to, the text of which is as follows:

### CANON: OF THE ELECTION OF A BISHOP.

(ADOPTED 7TH JULY, 1871.)

Whereas it is desirable to provide for the succession of the Episcopate in the Diocese of Fredericton, and whereas in accordance with the ancient usages of the Church, the election should be made by the Synod of the Diocese, the form of election shall be as follows:—

1. The Archdeacon, or if there be no Archdeacon, the Commissary of the late Bishop, or if there be no Archdeacon or Commissary, or if they shall refuse, or shall neglect for thirty days or more after a vacancy in the See shall have occurred to act, then any three Rural Deans in Priest's orders within the Diocese for the time being, shall summon a special meeting of the Diocesan Synod for the election of a Bishop, to be held not less than sixty nor more than ninety days after such vacancy shall have occurred, at which meeting no other business but such election shall be proceeded with.

2. The person who shall be chosen by the votes, taken by ballot, of at least two-thirds of the clergy and two-thirds of the lay delegates present at such meeting, or some adjournment thereof, shall be deemed elected to the office of Bishop of this Diocese. And this election shall not be vitiated by the absence of any of the parties summoned, or by the failure of any parish to elect a lay representative.

3. Any question as to the validity of the election to the vacant See shall be submitted, prior to the consecration of the person elected, to the Metropolitan of the See of Fredericton for the time being, whose decision shall be final.

4. The Synod may at such meeting, by a like majority of clergy and lay delegates as hereinbefore mentioned, delegate to the Metropolitan of the See of Fredericton for the time being, the power of choosing a Bishop for the vacant See; and such choice shall thereupon be final.

5. The choice of the Synod, or the delegation of its choice, shall be notified in writing to the Metropolitan of the See of Fredericton for the time being by the Chairman of the meeting and Secretary of the Synod, immediately after its decision.

6. The following declaration shall be made before the Metropolitan or some person duly appointed by him, by the Bishop elect, before his consecration, or, if already consecrated, before exercising any Episcopal functions in this Diocese: "I, N., chosen bishop of the See of Fredericton, do promise that I will teach and maintain the doctrine and discipline of the Church of England; and I also do declare that I consent to be bound by all the Rules and Regulations which have heretofore been made, or which may from time to time be made by the Synod of the Diocese of Fredericton; and in consideration of being appointed Bishop of the said See of Fredericton, I hereby undertake immediately to resign the said appointment, together with all the rights and emoluments appertaining thereto, if sentence requiring such resignation should at any time be passed upon me, after due examination had, by the tribunal acknowledged or appointed by the Synod of the said Diocese for the trial of a Bishop; saving all rights of appeal allowed by said Synod."

7. The above declaration in writing, signed by the Bishop elect, or a certified copy thereof, shall be filed with the Secretary of the Synod.

In order that the provisions of the existing law may be compared with those of the Canon for the appointment of a Bishop Coadjutor, recently submitted by the Lord Bishop, attention is also requested to the terms of this proposed Canon, which is as follows:—

#### CANON FOR THE APPOINTMENT AND ELECTION OF A BISHOP COADJUTOR.

1. Whenever at the request of the Bishop of the Diocese, or—if the Bishop should be mentally incapacitated—then whenever without such request the Synod shall by resolution declare it to be advisable that a Bishop Coadjutor for the Diocese should be appointed, the election of such Coadjutor shall, either at the meeting of the Synod at which such resolution shall be passed, or at a special meeting to be called for that purpose, be proceeded with in the manner hereinafter provided.

2. The Bishop shall submit to the Synod the name or names of one or more persons in Holy Orders in the Church of England and Ireland in Canada, or in some Church in full communion therewith, for election as such Bishop Coadjutor.

3. Upon such nomination being made by the Bishop, the Synod shall proceed to the election of a Bishop Coadjutor.

4. Such election shall be by ballot, and the votes of at least two-thirds of the Clergy, and two-thirds of the Lay Delegates present, shall be required to elect such Coadjutor.

5. Should the Synod fail to elect on such nomination, the Bishop may make a further nomination, and so from time to time; and the election upon any such further nomination shall be proceeded with as hereinbefore provided.

6. Should the Bishop decline to make further nomination in any such case, the proceedings for the election of a Bishop Coadjutor shall cease.

7. Should the Bishop at any time become so incapacitated by mental infirmity as to be unable to discharge the duties of his office, the Synod may, if it see fit, proceed to the election of a Bishop Coadjutor in like manner as in the case of a vacancy in the See.

8. When any person is duly elected Bishop Coadjutor, it shall be the duty of the Bishop, or of the Synod, forthwith to notify the Metropolitan of such



election, in order that the consecration of such Coadjutor may be proceeded with as in the case of Bishops of Sees in the Province of Canada.

9. The Bishop Coadjutor elect shall, before his consecration, make and subscribe before the Metropolitan, or some other person appointed by him, the following declaration:—"I, A. B., elected Bishop Coadjutor of the Diocese of Fredericton, do promise that I will teach and maintain the doctrine and discipline of the Church of England. And I do also declare that I consent to be bound by all the rules and regulations which have been made, or which may hereafter be made by the Synod of the said Diocese; and I hereby agree immediately to resign the said office of Coadjutor, together with all the rights and emoluments appertaining thereto, if sentence requiring such resignation shall at any time be passed upon me, after due examination and trial had by the Tribunal appointed by the Synod of the Diocese for the trial of a Bishop, saving all right of appeal allowed by the said Synod."

10. The said declaration, or a certified copy thereof, shall be forthwith filed with the Secretary of the Synod.

11. The Bishop Coadjutor shall perform such Diocesan duties, and exercise such Episcopal functions, as the Bishop may assign to him; or, in case of the mental incapacity of the Bishop, such functions as the Bishop himself might have exercised but for such incapacity.

12. Should any difference arise between the Bishop and his Coadjutor relative to their respective rights and duties, it shall be referred to, and decided by, the House of Bishops of the Province of Canada.

13. The Bishop Coadjutor, when duly consecrated, shall have the right of succession to the See of Fredericton, and shall succeed to the same immediately upon its becoming vacant, and shall be installed as such according to the Canons of the Province of Canada.

14. The Bishop Coadjutor shall have a seat in the Diocesan Synod, and the same right of voting therein as any Priest of the Diocese sitting in such Synod.

### EFFECT OF THE PROPOSED CANON.

It will readily be seen, by a comparison of the present and proposed laws, that while by the Canon of 1871, the right of nomination, as well as that of voting in the election of the next Bishop of the Diocese, is now vested in the Clergy and representatives of the Laity assembled in Synod, a principle which, as stated in the preamble of that Canon, is "in accordance with the ancient usages of the Church," by the proposed Canon this right of nomination would be taken from them, and vested solely in the Bishop.

It may be said, with reference to this change, that the proposed Canon deals only with the election of a Bishop Coadjutor or Assistant, but, as its thirteenth section gives the Coadjutor elected the absolute right of succession to the See of Fredericton immediately upon its thereafter becoming vacant, it is evident that the Canon in reality provides for the election of the next Bishop of the Diocese. The question therefore which the Clergy and Laity have now to decide is, whether or not it is either necessary or desirable that they should relinquish the right of nomination of a person to be their future Bishop, secured to them by the Canon of 1871, and accept

instead the limited privilege of voting merely upon such name or names as may be submitted to them.

As to the possible necessity for the appointment of a Coadjutor, there can be but little diversity of opinion, the Bishop having stated that he may shortly feel the need of an Assistant, in order that the work of the Diocese may be effectually carried on. Admitting this possibility, it becomes necessary to consider, 1st, the mode of appointment of a Bishop Coadjutor; 2nd, the rights and privileges he is to possess; and 3rd, the provision for his support.

### THE MODE OF APPOINTMENT.

The 2nd Section of the proposed Canon provides that the Bishop shall have the sole right of nominating candidates for the Coadjutorship. As the Bishop, in common with each Clerical and Lay member of the Synod, has full liberty to act in all matters which may come before that body, it is evident that this provision does not directly give him any new power. It, however, increases his present power, by taking from the Clergy and Laity the right of joint nomination, which, as members of the Synod, they would otherwise possess. And it may be fairly asked, what sufficient reasons are there for thus taking from those, who are so largely interested in the choice, such a reasonable privilege as that of sharing this right of nomination.

One reason given by his Lordship was, that after thirty-four years experience, it would be easier for him, than for the Clergy or Lay Delegates, to decide as to the requirements of the Diocese, and the qualifications which it is necessary that a Coadjutor should possess. Whatever force there may be in this reason, it is obviously an insufficient one for ignoring the Clergy and Laity in the matter of appointment altogether; and yet this argument, if really sound, and pursued to its legitimate conclusion, would have led the Synod, in 1871, when framing the Canon on election, to leave *the right of appointing his successor* to the Bishop himself, instead of vesting the right of choice in the Clergy and Laity of the Diocese. Any proposition, however, for confining the appointment to the Bishop would certainly then have been rejected; and, even admitting that a Bishop's experience in the Diocese would necessarily assist his judgment in the selection of a Coadjutor, it does not, by any means, follow that he would be the only competent judge. Surely the Clergy, at any rate, might also fairly claim to join in the selection. Might not some of their number be as well qualified by age and experience for judging as even the Bishop himself? Might they not even during



their association with him in the work of the Church, have noticed errors in judgment that did not appear in that light to him? And in the selection of his assistant or successor they might well wish to be free to nominate a person who, in their opinion, would avoid such errors in the future.

Another reason given by the Bishop for claiming the sole right of nomination is that the Coadjutor is to be *his assistant*. While this fact would certainly give the Bishop a sufficient reason for claiming a voice in the matter, it may surely be argued that the Clergy and Laity have a still stronger reason for claiming an equal right, on the ground that the person selected is to be *their Bishop*, whether granted the right of succession or not.

Another reason given is that the Bishop intends to contribute largely towards the support of the Coadjutor, but, as will be shown later on, this generous offer cannot well be accepted in any case, and this argument, therefore, falls to the ground.

As another reason it has been pleaded that the case is analogous to that of a Rector choosing his Curate, in which case the right of appointment rests with him.

If these cases really were analogous, the Bishop should possess the right of election or appointment, as well as of nomination, or, in other words, should have power to appoint his Coadjutor without even consulting the Synod—a power which his Lordship would, evidently, be unwilling to ask for, seeing that in his address at Fredericton he is reported to have disclaimed any desire to “lessen the rights and prerogatives of the Synod.” But it is manifestly unfair to speak of a person who is to perform the responsible duties of a Bishop Coadjutor as a mere Curate, or to compare his office with that of a Rector’s assistant in parochial work; and besides, the argument entirely ignores the 13th Section of the Canon which provides that the person elected is to have the absolute right of succession to the See. And who ever heard of a Curate “*Cum jure successionis?*”

Another argument which has been advanced in favor of the proposed Canon is that used by the Bishop in his address at Fredericton, when he said that his chief object in asking for the sole right of nomination was in order thereby to avoid the party strife and bad feeling which, judging from the experience of elections elsewhere, would probably ensue if the right of nomination were left with the Synod. A careful consideration of the matter will, however, shew that his Lordship’s laudable object would be far more likely to be defeated than gained if the Synod were to grant his request. To

illustrate this, the case of the election of Bishop Oxenden to the See of Montreal may be referred to. In the year 1865 a Canon had been passed by the Provincial Synod, and accepted by the Diocesan Synod of Montreal giving up the right of nomination to the House of Bishops, and reserving to the Synod of Montreal only the right of election,—a course somewhat similar to that defined by the Canon at present under consideration. On the decease of Bishop Fulford in 1868, proceedings were at once taken under the Canon of 1865 to appoint his successor. Names were again and again submitted by the House of Bishops, which the Diocesan Synod refused to accept. Unable to put forward their own candidates, a violent party spirit was aroused among the Clergy and Lay delegates, as great or greater than any other system could possibly have produced; the result being a resort to the very course which the Bishop of Fredericton has expressed himself as most anxious to avoid, viz, the acceptance of a compromise candidate, found in the person of Bishop Oxenden, who, after a brief residence in Canada, has since resigned his Episcopal charge, and returned to England.

As soon as possible after this election, the Provincial Synod repealed the objectionable Canon of 1865, and the Diocesan Synod of Montreal, being thus left free to act, have recently selected almost without debate, and are now working happily under a Bishop whom in 1868 they would have been glad to accept, but whose name at that time they were unable to bring forward for choice, owing to their having previously given up the right of nomination by the Canon referred to.

The experience of the Diocese of Montreal in this case goes far to shew that a speedy and satisfactory result can better be attained by leaving the Synod free to make its own nominations than by any other course.

In this connection, reference has been made to the recent election of a Bishop in the Diocese of Toronto, in which case, while the power of nomination *was* in the Synod, difficulty was experienced for a time in arriving at a decision. There, however, the difficulty arose from the fact that the wishes of the Clergy and Laity were antagonistic, which it is evident might happen under any circumstances; and this difficulty was finally settled in a satisfactory manner, and a harmonious conclusion arrived at.

There is a manifest difference between such a case and one wherein the Synod, although perhaps almost unanimous in its desire to elect a certain candidate, is unable to do so from having previously surrendered its right of nomination. The issue in the one case is

between two parties in the Synod, and can be settled by that body itself, whereas in the other it is between the Synod, on the one side, and the Bishop, over whom it of course has no control, on the other.

It must surely then be admitted that when the appointment of a Coadjutor is made, it is best that the privilege of joint nomination should be given to the three constituent parts of the representative body of the Church, viz: the Bishop, the Clergy, and the Laity. All are interested in the appointment; each has his peculiar fitness for judging as to the names to be brought forward; and each possesses the power of negating the nomination of the other or others if distasteful from personal reasons or otherwise.

And by following this course, and allowing full freedom of thought and expression, the best means will be taken to render the election acceptable generally to those who are to be affected by it; a result which will certainly commend itself as most desirable to all those, who, regardless of party considerations, desire to see a continuance of harmony in the Church.

The Bishop's nomination must of necessity carry great weight and influence in the Synod, and his legitimate influence would be increased rather than diminished, if the Synod possessed perfect freedom of action and were not limited solely to the alternative of accepting or rejecting the Bishop's nominee.

It has been argued that granting the right of nomination in any way to the Clergy and Laity might result in the election of a person whom, for special reasons, the Bishop could not accept as his Coadjutor. It is however a sufficient answer to this argument that while it is very improbable that two-thirds of the Clergy and Laity would knowingly unite in the selection of such a person; still, even in this contingency, the Bishop could exercise the right of veto which was purposely granted to him as a protection and safeguard in any emergency.

And would not the person ultimately selected be more fully assured that he was the choice of the Diocese, if nominated freely by the Synod, than if he were merely the nominee of the Bishop, approved by a majority vote of the other Orders.

There is also another argument of great weight against granting the sole right of nomination to the Bishop. It is past denial that the Church of England contains men of various schools of thought, high, low, and broad in their views, all of whom claim equal rights in the government of the Church, and are alike interested in its welfare.

Now is it not fair to suppose that a Bishop, in nominating a Co-

adjutor, would be likely to select candidates from the school to which he himself belongs? and would it not be manifestly unfair to members of the Synod who might think differently, thus to deprive them of the opportunity of nominating persons with whose theological views they would be more in sympathy?

If the plan of granting joint right of nomination to all parties were adopted, candidates from each school of thought might be brought forward, and then, after election, the minority would feel that every reasonable opportunity had been afforded them for electing the person of their choice, and they would consequently more cheerfully acquiesce in the result, if adverse to their views.

But even could it for a moment be considered wise to grant the sole right of nomination to the Bishop, two objectionable features in the mode of nomination proposed still remain. The second section of the proposed Canon gives the Bishop the right of submitting to the Synod merely *one* name if he sees fit, while the sixth section allows him the power to decline making further nominations at any time when he may think proper. The objections to these extraordinary provisions are so apparent that it is unnecessary to enlarge upon them. When the right of submitting but one name is given to the Bishop, and he may also at any time terminate the proceedings for election, it is scarcely worth while to dignify what remains to the Clergy and Lay delegates by the name of choice. It is a bare right of disapproval, and one which it would be a most delicate task to exercise if the name submitted were that of a Clergyman known to be strongly desired by the Bishop, however much the Clergy and Lay delegates might feel doubtful as to the wisdom of accepting him.

The second matter for consideration is

#### THE RIGHTS AND PRIVILEGES WHICH IT IS PROPOSED THE COADJUTOR SHALL POSSESS.

Under this head it is desired to draw attention to the 13th section of the proposed Canon, which provides that the Bishop Coadjutor shall have "the right of succession to the See of Fredericton, and shall succeed to the same immediately upon its becoming vacant."

As previously stated, it is quite evident from this that under the plea of electing a Coadjutor or Assistant to the present Bishop—a proposal to which, standing by itself, probably no Churchman would object—the Canon, if put in operation, will virtually guide the election of the next Bishop of the Diocese.

Neither the Bishop nor any of those who spoke in favor of the Canon at Fredericton seem to have claimed that this section was

desirable or wise, but simply that it would be found to be necessary because, they argued, a suitable person to fill the position could not be obtained unless this right were conceded to him.

There is probably no doubt that it would be difficult to obtain, in choosing a *Coadjutor*, such a person as the Diocese would desire to have for its next *Bishop*, unless the right of succession were given, —but when his Lordship stated this, he might have gone still farther, and said that probably it would be very difficult to persuade such a person to accept the position of *Coadjutor* or *Assistant* at all. For it must be remembered that the position of *Coadjutor* is only an inferior one, and that the person elected would be limited by Section 11 to the performance of such Diocesan duties and the exercise of such Episcopal functions as the Bishop may assign to him.

And is it likely that a Clergyman of high standing in the Church would accept such an inferior position either with or without the right of succession to the See? Surely it may fairly be argued that the Diocese would be likely to secure the services of a more competent person when it had a suitable position to offer him. And if so, it would be decidedly better to appoint the *Coadjutor* to hold office only during the lifetime of the present Bishop, whom he is to assist, and to leave the Synod free to elect the next Bishop when the See is vacant. If during the interval the *Coadjutor* proves himself to be competent for the higher position, it cannot be doubted that the Synod would then elect him to the office. And on the other hand, should it be evident that he was not competent or suitable, the Diocese would then be free to choose some one else to fill the position.

It is quite possible for a person to be able to perform the duties assigned to him as *Coadjutor* satisfactorily, and yet lack the administrative ability necessary and desirable in a Bishop; and the most prudent course certainly is for the Synod to postpone committing itself until it becomes positively necessary to do so.

In such an all-important matter as this, every caution should be exercised, and neither a regard for the Bishop nor the wish to make the position of *Coadjutor* as desirable as possible, should be allowed to interfere with a calm consideration of the future interests of the Church. At any rate the right of succession might be withheld until the Synod was thoroughly convinced by actual trial that it was impossible to obtain a suitable *Coadjutor* without it. And if it be ultimately found that in order to secure the services of a man of standing this right has to be granted, it will become all the more



necessary that the important power of nomination should be left freely with the Synod, as has been already claimed.

### THE PROVISION FOR SUPPORT OF THE BISHOP COADJUTOR.

The endowment of the See of Fredericton consists of the following items:

1st. Prior to the establishment of the See a fund was raised by subscription in New Brunswick amounting to about \$12,500, of which \$12,000 was invested in a Bond of the Rector, Church Wardens and Vestry of Trinity Church, St. John, at 5 per cent. interest, producing a revenue of \$600 per annum. The remaining \$500 was placed in the hands of the Bishop to be vested in Trustees on behalf of the Diocese, and will produce at 6 per cent. interest, a revenue of \$30 per annum.

2nd. Beyond the foregoing, the See is entirely dependent upon "The Colonial Bishopricks Fund."

Whether this fund is—

(a.) A Special Fund for the Diocese of Fredericton, available for the Bishop and his successors for ever:

(b.) A General Fund, from the income of which grants are made to Colonial Bishops, which will of necessity be continued to the Diocese of Fredericton among others, or

(c.) A General Fund from which such grants may be made at the option of the Trustees or otherwise, the income from which may terminate with the life of the present Bishop of Fredericton . . . . . appears to be uncertain and unknown. At the late meeting in Fredericton, the Bishop when appealed to, stated his inability to explain the exact conditions of the Fund, and undertook to obtain at once the required information. It is manifestly most important that it should be secured. For in the event even of a vacancy in the See it would be useless to ask any Clergyman of standing to take the Bishopric with a yearly income of but \$630, unless indeed he had large private means of his own, and an election under such circumstances would hand over the Diocese, not exactly to the highest bidder, but certainly to some one whose private means formed a part of his qualifications. It is to be hoped that the Colonial Bishopricks Fund will be found to be definitely charged with a fixed and permanent provision for the present and future Bishops of Fredericton. If not, or if the continuance of the grant be in any way optional or uncertain, the sooner the present local endowment is increased the better.

At the late meeting in Fredericton the Bishop stated his entire official income to be about \$5000, and generously offered out of this to contribute \$2500 towards the support of a Coadjutor. Now while the Bishop deserves every credit for this handsome offer, it requires but little reflection to see that it should not be accepted by the Diocese. Should the Synod by resolution declare it to be advisable or necessary that a Coadjutor Bishop be appointed, or for any cause whatever proceed to such a choice, surely his support should be provided for by the Diocese, and for many reasons. In the first place, when, after thirty-four years of labour in the Diocese, the Bishop asks for an assistant in his old age, how ungrateful it would be for the Synod to answer, "Yes, you may have an assistant, if you will pay him yourself." Surely Churchmen throughout the Diocese would not feel satisfied that they had done their duty in responding in such a manner as this to the Bishop's request.

And again, looking at the matter from a purely financial standpoint, it would be better for the Diocese to assume the responsibility of supporting the Bishop Coadjutor rather than accept the plan proposed. It is well known that the Bishop in years past has given away a very large part of his income in encouraging parochial work of all kinds throughout the Diocese. But if his Lordship has to contribute so largely towards the support of a Coadjutor, the different Parishes will not only lose his generous contributions (as he has already intimated would be the case), but indirectly also the stimulus given to local effort by his example, which has in time past largely encouraged and assisted so many. What then would be the result of an acceptance of this generous offer from the Bishop? With half his salary paid to a Coadjutor, and therefore no longer able to take the lead in subscriptions for Diocesan or parochial work, the Bishop would be reduced to a mere living. And would this be a fitting close for the long Episcopate of the first Bishop of Fredericton? Even already his Lordship has had to announce that if his offer is accepted he will be compelled to withdraw his promised subscription towards the Fredericton Divinity Chair. Surely Churchmen throughout the Diocese will not be willing to place their Bishop in such a position as this.

If a Coadjutor Bishop be required, the people to whom his services are to be given should support him. For years past the Diocese has been striving to become self-supporting in its parochial work, and it has prospered in the effort. To accept a Bishop Coadjutor on the terms now proposed would be returning towards a position of dependence, not a step in advance, but a retrogression.

And besides all this, would not the position of the Coadjutor be improved if his support were properly provided by the Diocese, rather than if he were dependent merely upon the Bishop, whom he is to assist?

### ANCIENT USAGES.

Efforts have been made by some of the advocates of the proposed Canon to show that its principles are supported by ancient precedent. It may be remarked, in passing, that the Bishop, in his address at Fredericton, did not rest any part of his argument on this basis, and, while precedents are certainly deserving of respect, no one will pretend that they are to be blindly followed without reference to the altered circumstances of the present day. It may be better, however, to refer briefly to some of the authorities on the subject.

A rule generally observed in the Church was that in one city there should be but one Bishop, though it was large enough to admit of many Presbyters. (Bingham *Eccles. Ant.* 1, 150.) The Council of Nice (A. D. 325) repeats and confirms this ancient rule in the Eighth Canon.—(Ib., 1, 153.)

To this rule Coadjutors were an exception.—(Ib., 1, 157.) The first on record occurred before the Nicene Council, when Narcissus, Bishop of Jerusalem, was disabled by reason of his great age, being a hundred and twenty years old (A. D. 237), and Alexander was made his Coadjutor. Subsequently such cases became more common, but continued exceptional until at least the time of the great St. Augustine (A. D. 391), who was ordained Bishop of Hippo while Valerius was living, and sat with him for some time as his Coadjutor; and who, we are told, "was of opinion that his own ordination was not regular, when afterwards he came to know the Nicene Canon."—(Ib., 1, 157-160.)

And as the exceptional cases of Coadjutors became more common, so the right of choice or appointment appears to have been taken from the Clergy and Laity; the Diocesan Bishops assumed the power of appointing their Coadjutors, and in some instances, even by their testaments, their successors in their Sees, (Ib., 1, 157-160, Milman's *Latin Christianity*, 2, 41, note C), and finally the Civil power intervened, and the right of choice by Clergy and people was lost altogether.

It appears, then—

1st. That in the early Church the office of Bishop Coadjutor was

purely exceptional, was established by degrees only, and was opposed to a Canon of the First General Council.

2nd. That, as the office became more common, and the Bishop of the Diocese assumed the right of appointment, the earlier rule, giving the choice of their Bishop to the Clergy and Laity, was infringed; and finally their right of election was entirely destroyed and lost.

Apparently, in anticipation of the opposition which was certain to develop itself to the terms of the proposed Canon, it has been suggested to make its adoption exceptional, and to give the power of nominating a Coadjutor, with right of succession, only to the present Bishop of Fredericton, and it is worthy of note that his Lordship himself stated, at the late meeting in Fredericton, his willingness that the Canon should be thus amended. It may fairly be asked, why is this? Surely if its provisions are proper and unobjectionable, there need not be any hesitation as to its permanency. But is there not in the very remark referred to a virtual admission that the Canon, as proposed, is not what it ought to be?

And is not the answer to the above suggestion to be found in the history of the past? The present case would form a precedent, and the exception become eventually the rule. If the right be given to one Bishop, how, without invidious distinction, can it be denied to his successor; and so, step by step, the present rights of Clergy and Laity would be impaired until, as actually occurred in the middle ages, they were entirely destroyed.

### CONCLUSION.

It has hitherto been the practice of the Synod to avoid passing important measures without full and sufficient notice having been previously given. Indeed, the 16th section of the Constitution provides that any proposition for its alteration must be introduced in writing, and lie over till the next meeting of the Synod for adoption. It would seem as though this would have been the proper way to proceed in regard to the proposed Canon, seeing that its passage involves a surrender by the Clergy and Laity of such valued and important rights. For like reasons, it was thought by many that the adoption of the Canon, at the late meeting in Fredericton, would have been hasty and unwise, and this more especially because the various congregations throughout the Diocese were unaware, until almost the last moment, that the introduction at that meeting of such a measure was even contemplated.

Owing to the discovery that the meeting referred to had not been legally called, no business was transacted, and the consideration of the Canon was, in consequence, postponed until a special meeting of the Synod should be convened for that purpose, the time suggested being the eighth of October next.

Some opportunity is, therefore, now afforded for Churchmen generally throughout the Diocese to consider the Canon; and it is to be hoped that they will, without unnecessary delay, give their attention to the matter.

To any one who carefully studies its provisions, it must be evident that the proposed Canon would virtually take all real power as to the selection of the future Bishops of the Diocese, from the Clergy and Laity, and transfer it to the Bishop for the time being, to be exercised at his own discretion. For by the Canon, in its present form, the Bishop alone has the right of nomination. He may send down but one name at a time, if he sees fit. And if his nominee is not forthwith accepted, he can at once decline to make any further nominations whatever, and thus leave the Synod in the anomalous position of having met to appoint a Coadjutor, who is also to be the future Bishop of the Diocese, without having the power to carry their wishes into effect.

Practically, then, if the right of succession to the See is granted, *the power of selecting his own successor* will be given to the Bishop or the Diocese.

Such a complete surrender by the Clergy and Laity of their rights and privileges cannot surely be expected. Neither is it desirable or prudent that such absolute power should be vested in any one person, even though that person be the Bishop of the Diocese. Surely the Clergy and Laity will refuse thus easily to part with the rights which are secured to them by the Constitution of the Synod and the Canon of 1871; and by their refusal, while not in any way impairing the Bishop's just rights, retain for themselves perfect freedom of action, and also avoid the possibility of such an objectionable contest as might arise under the proposed Canon, should the Bishop's nomination not be in accordance with the wishes of the Synod.



